UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/691,980	10/19/2000	Robert A. Davidson	783/76	6540

36829   7590   08/12/2004

SCHWARTZ LAW FIRM, P.C.
6100 FAIRVIEW ROAD
SUITE 530
CHARLOTTE, NC 28210

EXAMINER
SINGH, RACHNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/691,980	DAVIDSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rachna Singh	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _22 April 2004_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-40_ is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-40_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _3/11/04_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 4/22/04.

2. Claims 1-40 are pending. Claims 1, 21, 30, and 36 are independent claims.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 4/22/03 have been fully considered. Examiner agrees that a reference teaching shipment/scheduling information was lacking in the previously cited prior art with respect to claim 1 and other independent claims. Examiner has withdrawn the previous rejection. A new grounds of rejection are presented below in view of the following comments:

Applicant argues that Lamb's calendaring system does not disclose presenting the events within a tabular register of days (i.e. calendar display format). Lamb teaches that appointments can be displayed in the fields of a single day, a week, or a month. A display of fields in a month display would present events in a tabular register of days as a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would recognize. A monthly calendar is usually partitioned into a tabular registry of days by definition. Furthermore, the claims recite a calendar display format which is simply a schedule of events and is not limited to a "monthly tabular display" and can include a weekly, daily, or monthly format.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2 and 4-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al., US 6,029,140, 2/22/00 (filed 5/10/99) in view of Lamb et al., US 6,034,686, 3/7/00 (filed 3/9/98).

In reference to Independent claim 1, 30, and 36, Martin teaches an on-time delivery, tracking, and reporting system. Martin's system is programmed for setting and reporting product delivery dates. The invention includes maintaining a customer preferences database having delivery and reporting preferences for customers. The system maintains customer order and delivery information where the delivery and reporting preferences included delivery limits, times, etc. See abstract and column 2, lines 30-67. Compare to *"a shipment data repository containing shipment and scheduling information; a system interface communicating with said shipment data repository"*. Martin's system is programmed to schedule shipment dates and delivery dates according to the information in the database and deliver information to an order scheduler. Martin's system teaches associating shipment information to specific delivery dates; however, he does not recite the use of a calendar display interface comprising an interactive shipment data link where shipment information is electronically associated with the link. Lamb teaches a calendaring program or an electronic "date book" in which appointments are scheduled. See abstract and figure 1. Lamb's system consists of links or buttons to provide more

information about a specific appointment. See column 4 and figure 1. Upon clicking on these buttons, more detailed information about the appointment is made available to the user. See figure 1 and columns 4-5. Compare to *"an interactive. . .data link electronically associated with. . information, and cooperating with said system interface as commanded by the user to access and retrieve the associated. . .information contained in the data repository; and a calendar display interface for displaying said . . .planner to the user in a calendar format, such that the data link is provided on the . . .event date associated with the . . information"*. Thus Lamb discloses presenting an interactive data link on a calendar from which more detailed information about an appointment can be presented to the user. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time to combine the shipment/delivery system of Martin in an environment such as Lamb as Lamb is able to organize and provide information regarding important appointments (i.e. delivery dates). Lamb's calendaring program is analogous to a 'date book' or "planner' in which any information including the shipment date information taught by Martin could be implemented. See column 1, lines 10-42 in which Lamb cites, *"computers typically include an application program for scheduling and keeping track of appointments and other calendaring functions"*. Lamb further recites, *"it is often impossible to display an entire day's appointment at one time in a size that allows reading of text associated with the appointments"*. As Martin's shipment/delivery information according to delivery dates reads on "appointments and other calendaring functions", and Lamb

teaches the need to display more detailed information concerning appointments (i.e. shipment details).

In reference to claim 2, Martin teaches retrieving shipment information from a database and routing the information to an order scheduler.

In reference to claim 4, Lamb teaches that clicking on certain buttons such as "details" or "new" will lead the user to a predetermined portion of the information. See column 4. It would have been obvious to have a link lead to a specific portion of the information (including the shipment information of Martin) as links are generally utilized for the purpose of retrieving information.

In reference to claims 5-6, Martin's delivery, tracking, and reporting system teaches that for every shipment there is a customer order entry including a delivery date. See column 2, lines 35-45.

In reference to claims 7-9, 31-33 and 37, Martin teaches having flags for ship dates and dock dates. See column 3, lines 5-20. Martin teaches that flags are used to distinguish ship dates (outbound) from dock dates (inbound). It would have been obvious to implement Martin's system to the system of Lamb to help identify which shipments are outbound and inbound in order to help the user distinguish the two. While Martin does not use color-codes, he does utilize an equally effective method of distinction (flags). See column 3.

In reference to claims 10-11 and 38, Martin does not teach customizing the format of the calendar display interface; however, Lamb does. Lamb teaches that a user may set the format to display a single day, a week, or a year. Lamb's system includes the appointment list data structure as well as a database. See

column 3 and column 4, lines 1-22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a display customization, as a user may prefer different options such as a month layout to see an overview of a day layout to see information just for a day.

In reference to claims 12 and 13, Lamb teaches using a mouse to select the data link that provides information about the schedule. See figure 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize an input device as it is well known in the art to make a selection using an input device such as a keyboard or mouse.

In reference to claims 14-15 and 39, Martin teaches a system for generating and delivering reports to a customer in which the report is formatted according to a customer's preferences database. See column 5, lines 1-40. Such reports aid in helping the user measure his performance concerning deliver times and other variables. See column 5, lines 40-67.

In reference to claims 16-18, 34-35, and 40, Martin does not teach the personal event information interface; however, Lamb does. Lamb teaches scheduling appointments. These appointments are not limited to any specific category thus could be for "personal event data". As discussed above, Lamb teaches a calendaring program or an electronic "date book" in which appointments are scheduled. See abstract and figure 1. Lamb's system consists of links or buttons to provide more information about an appointment. See column 4 and figure 1. Upon clicking on these buttons, more information about the appointment is made available to the user. See figure 1 and columns 4-5. It

would have been obvious to include personal appointment information in the shipment planner as taught jointly by Martin and Lamb as it extends the use from not only shipment information but personal use as well.

In reference to claims 19 and 20, Martin does not teach the link comprising a predetermined portion of the information; however, Lamb teaches that clicking on certain buttons such as "details" or "new" will lead the user to a predetermined portion of the information. See column 4. It would have been obvious to have a link lead to a specific portion of the information, as that is what links are generally utilized for. While neither Lamb nor Martin teaches that the link comprises the title of the information, it is not unlikely for a link to indicate a title or heading about what the link contains.

In reference to claims 21 and 22, Martin teaches an on-time delivery, tracking, and reporting system. Martin's system is programmed for setting and reporting product delivery dates. The invention includes maintaining a customer preferences database having delivery and reporting preferences for customers. The system maintains customer order and delivery information where the delivery and reporting preferences included delivery limits, times, etc. See abstract and column 2, lines 30-67. Compare to *"a shipment data repository containing shipment and scheduling information; a system interface communicating with said shipment data repository"*. Martin's system is programmed to schedule shipment dates and delivery dates according to the information in the database and deliver information to an order scheduler. Martin's system teaches associating shipment information to specific delivery

dates; however, he does not recite the use of a calendar display interface comprising an interactive shipment data link where shipment information is electronically associated with the link. Lamb teaches a calendaring program or an electronic "date book" in which appointments are scheduled. See abstract and figure 1. Lamb's system consists of links or buttons to provide more information about a specific appointment. See column 4 and figure 1. Upon clicking on these buttons, more detailed information about the appointment is made available to the user. See figure 1 and columns 4-5. Compare to *"an interactive. . .data link electronically associated with. . information, and cooperating with said system interface as commanded by the user to access and retrieve the associated. . .information contained in the data repository; and a calendar display interface for displaying said . . .planner to the user in a calendar format, such that the data link is provided on the . . .event date associated with the . . information"*. Thus Lamb discloses presenting an interactive data link on a calendar from which more detailed information about an appointment can be presented to the user. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time to combine the shipment/delivery system of Martin in an environment such as Lamb as Lamb is able to organize and provide information regarding important appointments (i.e. delivery dates). Lamb's calendaring program is analogous to a 'date book' or "planner' in which any information including the shipment date information taught by Martin could be implemented. See column 1, lines 10-42 in which Lamb cites, *"computers typically include an application program for scheduling and*

keeping track of appointments and other calendaring functions". Lamb

further recites, *"it is often impossible to display an entire day's appointment*

at one time in a size that allows reading of text associated with the

appointments". As Martin's shipment/delivery information according to delivery

dates reads on "appointments and other calendaring functions", and Lamb

teaches the need to display more detailed information concerning appointments

(i.e. shipment details).

Martin does not teach the personal event information interface; however,

Lamb does. Lamb teaches scheduling appointments. These appointments are

not limited to any specific category thus could be for "personal event data". As

discussed above, Lamb teaches a calendaring program or an electronic "date

book" in which appointments are scheduled. See abstract and figure 1. Lamb's

system consists of links or buttons to provide more information about an

appointment. See column 4 and figure 1. Upon clicking on these buttons, more

information about the appointment is made available to the user. See figure 1

and columns 4-5. Compare to *"a personal event data respository. . .an*

interactive personal event data link. . .a calendar display interface. . ."

It would have been obvious to include personal appointment information of Lamb

in the shipment planner taught jointly by Lamb/Martin as it extends the use from

not only shipment information but personal use as well. Furthermore, See

column 1, lines 10-42 in which Lamb cites, *"computers typically include an*

application program for scheduling and keeping track of appointments and

other calendaring functions". Martin further teaches having flags for ship

dates and dock dates. See column 3, lines 5-20. Martin teaches that flags are used to distinguish ship dates (outbound) from dock dates (inbound). It would have been obvious to implement Martin's system of flagging ship dates and dock dates to the system of Lamb to help identify different types of shipments along with distinguishing "personal" versus "shipment" information as flags are an equally efficient way of distinguishing different types of data just as color-codes are. Compare to *"wherein the shipment data link and said personal event data link are color-coded to readily distinguish between associated shipment and scheduling information and the personal events information; and a legend for indicated the color-code for each of said shipment data and personal event data links"*.

In reference to claims 23 and 24, Martin's delivery, tracking, and reporting system teaches that for every shipment there is a customer order entry including a delivery date.

In reference to claims 25-26, Martin does not teach the link comprising a predetermined portion of the information; however, Lamb teaches that clicking on certain buttons such as "details" or "new" will lead the user to a predetermined portion of the information. See column 4. It would have been obvious to have a link lead to a specific portion of the information, as that is what links are generally utilized for. While neither Lamb nor Martin teaches that the link comprises the title of the information, it is not unlikely for a link to indicate a title or heading about what the link contains.

In reference to claim 27, Martin does not teach customizing the format of the calendar display interface; however, Lamb does. Lamb teaches that a user may set the format to display a single day, a week, or a year. Lamb's system includes the appointment list data structure as well as a database. See column 3 and column 4, lines 1-22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a display customization, as a user may prefer different options such as a month layout to see an overview of a day layout to see information just for a day.

In reference to claims 28-29, Martin teaches a system for generating and delivering reports to a customer in which the report is formatted according to a customer's preferences database. See column 5, lines 1-40. Such reports aid in helping the user measure his performance concerning deliver times and other variables. See column 5, lines 40-67.

6.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al., US 6,029,140, 2/22/00 (filed 5/10/99) in view of Lamb et al., US 6,034,686, 3/7/00 (filed 3/9/98), as applied above in claim 1, and further in view of Adler et al., US 6,675,356 B1, Jan. 6, 2004 (filed 12/22/98)

In reference to claim 3, Martin and Lamb do not explicitly state the use of a system interface comprising a web browser; however, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would recognize that a web browser is a common system interface in which to communicate with a database. This is illustrated by Adler. Adler teaches displaying the system interface within a web page. See column 13, lines 20-28. It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Adler's web

browser interface in the system of Martin/Lamb as Adler teaches the use of a

calendaring system and extracting relevant information from the calendar. See

abstract.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

Howard et al.   US 6,217,076 B1

Cummings, Jr. et al.   US 6,345,260 B1

Martin et al.   US 6,292,784 B1

O'Neill et al.   US 6,219,653 B1

Powell et al.   US 2001/0049619 A1

Slotznick   US 6,108,640

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Rachna Singh whose telephone number is

703.305.1952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8AM-5:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on 703.305.9792. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703.872.9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application

or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is

703.305.3900.

RS
8/6/04

SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER